(b) whether Supreme Court has given any direction regarding dereservation of creamy layers amongst the SC, ST and OBC category;

(c) if so, the action' being taken by Government regarding such direction;

(d) whether any provision is under consideration to keep special quota of reservation for the women of the abovesaid categories; and

(e) if not, the reasons thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI D. PURANDESWARI): (*a)* to (c) The implementation of the provisions of "The Central Educational Institutions (Reservation in Admission) Act, 2006" in so far as it relates to 27% reservation of OBC's has been kept on hold for the academic year 2007-08 by Supreme Court of India *vide* its interim Order dated 29th March, 2007. The matter is however listed, for hearing on the 8th May, 2007 before the apex court.

(d) No, Sir.

(e) The Central Educational Institutions (Reservation in Admission) Act, 2006 has no such provision.

Review of judges strength

3408. SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that strength of judges in Session Courts and in High Courts is sanctioned on the basis of periodical review of the trend of volume of cases pending and additions thereto;

(b) the details of mechanism entrusted ,with the task of such review;

(c) the details of reviews carried out during the last five years;

(d) the details of revisions of judges strength culminated, if any, from such review exercises; and

(e) the details of actions taken for implementation of the revisions at Sessions Courts and High Courts levels respectively, State-wise?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI K. VENKATAPATHY): (a) to (e) In pursuance of the judgment of the Supreme Court of October 6,1993 in the Supreme Court Advocates on Record & Anrs. *vs.* the Union of India, the judge strength of the High Courts is reviewed every three years:

1.1 As per the guidelines, the required strength of permanent Judges in a High Court is worked out by dividing the average institution of main cases during the last five years by the national average or the average rate of disposal of main cases per Judge per year in that High Court, whichever is higher.

1.2 Similarly, the required strength of Additional judges in a High Court is worked out by dividing the number of main cases pending over two years by the national average or the average rate of disposal of main cases per Judge per year in that High court, whichever is higher.

1.3 If the disposal per Judge in the concerned High Court is below even the national average then instead of increasing the strength, the concerned High Court is required to take steps for improvement in the rate of disposal of cases. If the average disposal of concerned High Court is above the national average then increase in Judge strength is accordingly considered. The strength of Additional Judges is reviewed only if there is an increase in the arrears of the pending cases during the last 5 years and the disposal per Judge is above the national average.

1.4 In the review undertaken in the year 2003, 94 new posts were recommended. As an interim review, 4 posts of Judges were approved for the Bombay High Court in 2005, making the total for increase of 98 posts. The last triennial review was held in the year 2006, when 106 posts of Judges, subject to concurrence of the respective State Governments, have been approved in various High Courts as per details given below:

(i)	Allahabad	65 Judges
(ii)	Andhra Pradesh	27 Judges
(Hi)	Calcutta	08 Judges
(iv>	Delhi	01 Judge
(v)	Karnataka	01 Judge
(vi)	Kerala	01 Judge

(vii)	Punjab & Haryana	02 Judges
(viii)	Madhya Pradesh	01 Judge

2. With regard to subordinate judiciary, the Supreme Court, in its judgment of 21st March, 2002 in W.P (Civil) No. 1022 of 1989-AII India Judges'Association & Ors *Vs.* Union of India & Ors, has directed that an increase in the Judge strength from the existing 10.5 or 13 per 10 lakh people to 50 judges per 10 lakh people should be effected the implemented within a period of five years in a phased manner to be determined and directed by the Union Ministry of Law. It had also directed that the existing vacancies in the Subordinate Courts at all levels should be filled in all the States.

2.1 The Central Government has filed an affidavit in the Supreme Court paying that the increase in judge strength in the Union Territories for which Central Government is administratively responsible be allowed based on workload and pendency of cases. All the State Governments are also party to the All India Judges Case.

2.2 Under article 235 of the Constitution of India, the administrative control over the member of subordinate judiciary in the States vests with the concerned High Court and the State Government. Thus as regards the judge strength in the District and subordinate courts, the primary responsibility for taking necessary action for increasing the judge strength vests with the respective State Governments.

Irregularities in voters' lists

3409.MS SUSHILA TIRIYA: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that school boys are being enlisted in the voters' list in Orissa;'

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) what action Government propose/have taken against the concerned officials?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): (a) The Election Commission has intimated that the data of electors,